



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

80
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/672,602	09/29/2000	Carl M. Ellison	042390.P8629X	2068
7590	03/17/2005			EXAMINER ABRISHAMKAR, KAVEH
Thinh V Nguyen Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP 12400 Wilshire Boulevard 7th Floor Los Angeles, CA 90025			ART UNIT 2131	PAPER NUMBER
			DATE MAILED: 03/17/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	09/672,602	Applicant(s) ELLISON ET AL.
Examiner Kaveh Abrishamkar	Art Unit 2131	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 February 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
 - a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 - b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The reply was filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing an appeal brief. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 - (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: None.

Claim(s) objected to: None.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-80.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Attachment.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____.
13. Other: _____.

Advisory Action

1. This Office action is in response to communication filed on February 28, 2005.

Claims 1-80 were originally received for consideration. Per the received amendment, claims 1-3,17-19, 21-23, 37-39, 41-43, 46-55, 57-59, 61-63, 78 and 79 are amended.

No claims were cancelled or added. Claims 1-80 are pending in the application.

Applicant's request for consideration has been fully considered but they are not persuasive because of the following reasons:

1. The applicant in regards to independent claims 1, 21, 41, and 61 argues that the cited prior art, England et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,652), does not teach an "isolated execution mode" stating that the interpretation given in the previous Office action was too broad. This argument is not found persuasive. The claim language in claim 1, does not sufficiently establish that "isolated execution mode" is different than the interpretation given in the previous Office action. The "isolated execution mode" disclosed in the independent claims, can be interpreted, as a mode in which other applications or other unauthorized areas of memory cannot access, or an "isolated memory area." England discloses a segment of memory (DRMOS) that prohibits the use of certain programs, prevents tampering, provides a secure storage space, and can prohibit all access when a trusted application is running (executing) (column 15 line 62 – column 16 line 67). The function of preventing access to a memory while a certain application is running can be interpreted as "isolated execution mode" because access is prohibited while the trusted application is running in the DRMOS. Furthermore, the

Art Unit: 2131

applicant argues that the CPA does not disclose a "digest memory." This argument is not found persuasive. The CPA teaches that the DRMOS has an isolated secure key storage area. The keys (digests) are stored are used to validate components (programs) before they are loaded into the DRMOS (isolated memory area) and a cryptographic hash of all the components that are loaded into the DRMOS is made (column 12 lines 53 – 65) and are stored in an internal register in the CPU. The applicant argues that both CPA references, England et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,327,652) and Ermolovich (U.S. Patent No. 4,319,323) do not disclose an "isolated execution mode" and therefore there is no motivation to combine the references. However, in view of the above interpretation of "isolated execution mode," the argument is not found persuasive. England and Ermolovich are directed at memory devices. England discloses providing an "isolated memory" while Ermolovich uses command signals to control the processing of data in memory. Therefore the CPA references are viewed as analogous arts, and in view with England's "isolated execution mode," are viewed as a logical combination.

2. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kaveh Abrishamkar whose telephone number is 571-272-3786. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2131

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

KA
03/11/05


AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100